

# CAUT/ACPU

## BULLETIN

**MAY/MAI 1965**

A Publication of

Publié Par

L'ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE DES PROFESSEURS D'UNIVERSITE

THE CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS

# CANADIAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY TEACHERS

<i>Association</i>		<i>1963-64*President</i>	<i>Secretary</i>	<i>Treasurer</i>
1. Acadia	9	R. H. MacNeill		Shirley Chute
2. Alta. Calgary	96	J. G. Nelson	H. Mitchell	F. Terentiuk
3. Alta. Edmonton	382	I. C. Sowton	G. O. Mackie	A. S. Knowler
4. Bishop's	36	T. A. Judson	E. H. Yarrill	R. E. G. Duval
5. Brandon	34	J. W. Grant	John C. Courtney	William Peters
6. U.B.C.	794	John Norris	Anne MacCreary	M. Wheeler
7. Carleton	104	T. J. S. Cole	B. W. Jones	N. E. S. Griffiths
8. Dalhousie	87	M. A. Usmiani	Eunice Beeson	R. Comeau
9. Jean de Brébeuf	20	M. Lambert		R. Bergeron
10. Guelph	235	H. D. Ayers	D. E. Elrick	W. M. Braithwaite
11. Lakehead	23	D. Lindsay		M. N. Patterson
12. Laurentian	40	V. L. Berg	Pierre Fortier	Gérard Barrette
13. Laval	372	Ludovic Ouellet	Louis Rousseau	Robt. McGoldrick
14. Loyola	56	Ronald Wareham	Robert Ruigh	Ronald Coyte
15. Manitoba	293	Iain Cooke	A. W. Wood	R. C. McGinnis
16. McGill	470	P. R. Wallace	B. A. Rattray	A. Lloyd Thompson
17. McMaster	186	Robert W. Thompson	Hugh Robinson	Alexis Jamieson
18. Memorial	90	J. D. Eaton	Miss O. Broomfield	D. H. Rendell
19. Montreal	250	Jacques Henripin	G. de Montigny	Abel Gauthier
20. Mt. Allison	51	R. Boorne		R. S. Malpass
21. U.B.C.	111	R. L. Rosenberg	E. W. Hale	J. F. Earl
22. N.S. Tech	5	W. H. Ahern		C. R. Baird
23. Ottawa	61	Donat Pharand	C. Mailhot	V. Bergeron
24. Queen's	217	Richard Gosse	W. Carter	G. K. Rush
25. St. Francis X	59	Yves Brunelle		Desmond Connor
26. St. John's	22	A. H. Adamson	J. C. Wenk	W. Fox-Decent
27. St. Mary's	20	J. R. MacCormack		Donald B. Warner
28. St. Paul's	22	A. Giesinger		L. A. Desmond
29. Sask. Regina	61	O. G. Holmes	M. E. P. Henderson	K. G. West
30. Sask. Saskatoon	294	D. R. Cherry	K. L. McEwen	B. L. Strayer
31. Sherbrooke		G. Joncas	Jean Melanson	J. Desnoyers
32. Sir Geo. Wms.	84	E. E. McCullough		Mrs. Anne Stokes
33. Toronto	690	C. B. Macpherson	J. H. G. Crispo	I. L. Armstrong
34. United	45	W. A. Morrison	F. W. Barth	E. E. Reimer
35. Victoria	122	R. E. L. Watson	C. V. Brooke	W. Benzie
36. Waterloo	105	Richard Walters	Angus Bruneau	J. B. Capindale
37. Waterloo Luth.	47	M. D. Stewart	C. W. Anderson	W. E. Gwatkin
38. Western	252	Gordon Turner	W. J. L'Heureux	C. G. Winder
39. Windsor	123	E. D. Lemire	P. J. Shontz	J. E. Kanasy
40. York	31	A. L. Murray	Beryl Rowland	C. D. MacNiven
41. Headquarters	21			

# CAUT / ACPU

## BULLETIN

*A Publication of / Publié par*  
L'Association Canadienne des Professeurs d'Université  
The Canadian Association of University Teachers

---

Volume/Tome 13 *May/Mai 1965* Number/Numéro 4

---

### TABLE OF CONTENTS / TABLE DES MATHIERES

	Page
The J. H. Stewart Reid Memorial Fellowship Trust—an Editorial .....	2
The Importance of Greatness—by C. T. Bissell .....	3
University Government—Trends and a New Model—by H. B. Mayo .....	10
The Committee on Financial Assistance for University Teachers Pursuing Advanced Studies .....	25
Brief to the Advisory Committee on Broadcasting .....	29
Selected Fringe Benefits Available in 1965 at Canadian Universities and Colleges—by Witold Weynerowski .....	33
C.A.U.T. Press Release, March 25, 1965 .....	46
Review of Ingraham, Mark H.; <i>The Outer Fringe: Faculty Benefits Other Than Annuities and Insurance</i> —by Witold Weynerowski .....	48
Notice of Positions Vacant .....	50
Notice of Persons Available for Appointment .....	51

---

Published four times a year in February, April, October, and December.  
Subscription rate: one year for \$2.00.

*Executive Secretary:* J. Percy Smith, C.A.U.T. National Office, Room 603, Commonwealth Bldg., 77 Rue Metcalfe St., Ottawa, Ontario.

*Editor:* Betty Bandeen, Middlesex College, University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario.

*Associate Editor:* Laurie Gauvin, Université Laval, Québec, P.Q.

*Advertising Office:* 34 Bater Ave., Toronto 6, Ont., Telephone: HO 3-3620

Printed by Hunter Printing London Limited, London, Ontario.

Authorized as second class mail by the Post Office Department, Ottawa, and for payment of postage in cash.

## THE J. H. STEWART REID MEMORIAL FELLOWSHIP TRUST

### *An Editorial*

Everyone who knew Stewart Reid and who understood and valued the contribution he made to the vitality and strength of C.A.U.T. will want to do everything within their power to ensure the success of the Memorial Fellowship that has been set up in his name. I should like to appeal here to those members of our association who have had little direct contact with Stewart Reid and thus may not realize how hard and effectively he worked during the final years of his career in promoting the interests and welfare of university teachers.

As a faculty member at United College during the Crowe dispute Reid demonstrated rare courage by refusing to compromise on questions of principle and by resigning in protest against the injustice involved in that affair. In his subsequent years with C.A.U.T. he was able to make a notable contribution to the cause of academic freedom and tenure in Canada. On a surprisingly large number of occasions he was called upon to advise individual faculty members involved in disputes with their administration and discuss the issues involved with the Principals or Governing Boards of the colleges in question. In the course of these discussions not only was Reid often able to obtain an equitable settlement of the dispute but he also did much to educate Boards and University Heads on questions of proper academic freedom and tenure.

The investigation of University government which is just getting under way in Canada also owes a good deal to the energy and perseverance with which Reid pursued the wishes of the Executive Council on this question. These are but two of the many ways in which he helped build C.A.U.T. into a strong and effective organization. All university teachers owe him more than they may ever realize.

Clarence L. Barber

## THE IMPORTANCE OF GREATNESS

by C. T. Bissell\*

An address delivered by Dr. Bissell to the Vancouver Alumni Association on Tuesday, February 6th, and to the North California Alumni Association on Friday, February 19th, 1965.

I suppose that there is no university in Canada that has not at some time been referred to as a great institution. The adjective drops easily from the lips of the Commencement speaker, especially if he has just received an honorary degree. In our heart of hearts we know that usually the tribute is not strictly merited, and that for the time being we are in the world of polite fiction. By the highest standards there are only a few great universities in the world, just as at any time there are only a few great men. I doubt whether an international jury would select any Canadian university for membership in the supreme circle, although such a jury would pause seriously over the claims of a few.

What are the characteristics of a great university? Your answer depends on your criteria, and that in turn on your educational philosophy. Having given you this caution, I shall attempt an answer. The first characteristic is that the university is a stronghold of scholarship in the pure theoretical subjects that lie at the basis of any expansion of knowledge. If I were asked to name them I would say they are Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Mathematics, Political Science, Economics, Literature, History, Philosophy. I realize that there are other strong claimants, so I shall describe my list as illustrative and personal rather than as comprehensive and official. These subjects occupy a special place because they are the sources to which all divisions of the university must regularly return. Thus we call Engineering the Faculty of Applied Science, and other professional faculties likewise deal in the application of knowledge derived from the basic disciplines. I am not suggesting that professional faculties are always derivative and secondary. For the application of theoretical knowledge—witness the clinical sciences in Medicine—demands a knowledge of traditional practice, a sensitivity to the human situation, a nice ordering of idea to special situation that together create separate and autonomous disciplines. But I do say that a university cannot be described as great unless it can within itself generate knowledge in the pure, theoretical disciplines.

---

\*President, University of Toronto.



The centrality of the pure disciplines explains why the first question that one asks of the university is, "How many eminent scholars does the university have in, say, Physics, or Chemistry, or Mathematics, or English Literature; or, to phrase the question more specifically, how many members of these departments are known and recognized in international gatherings?" A crude criterion for the determination of excellence among universities is the number of scholars who hold fellowships in leading international societies, or have received international awards. Thus, the pursuit of Nobel Prize winners by American universities is exceeded in pertinacity and in financial recklessness only by the pursuit of star college quarterbacks by professional teams. The University of California at Berkeley owes some of its eminence to the fact that its Nobel Prize roster is the largest and the most glistening in the world. The possession of the very eminent is a relevant but not conclusive criterion for greatness. There is no guarantee that Nobel Prize winners will repeat their triumph. They may become lone wolves who retreat to an ivory cage and snarl at students and colleagues alike. It is healthier to have a group of able men who work together and create an atmosphere that is receptive and exhilarating. The concept of the team is particularly applicable to the sciences. In recent years the Physics Department at the University of Toronto has grown greatly in strength because there is a balance in interest and grouping between the theoretical and experimental, with each supplementing and supporting the other.

The second characteristic of the great university is that it has graduate and undergraduate divisions that are both strong. Thus there are many fine institutions in the United States and Canada that have achieved distinction for their undergraduate work, especially in the Liberal Arts, but they fall short of greatness because they make little contribution to the advancement of knowledge. In Europe and Asia, particularly in the Communist countries, there are many institutions of higher learning that are exclusively concerned with research, and these, too, no matter how illustrious, cannot merit the accolade of greatness. In Canada we have been notoriously slow in the development of our graduate schools. Indeed, one might say that until very recently there was a disinclination to develop graduate work in a systematic fashion. That was a task to be undertaken by the great centres in the United States and a few in Europe; we should content ourselves with making undergraduate work respectable. We are now in the process of developing our graduate schools in a way not contem-

plated a few years ago. At the University of Toronto, for instance, we have in the last three years doubled the number of our graduate students, from approximately 1,000 to approximately 2,000, and we anticipate another doubling by 1970 or 1971. Indeed, by 1975 we estimate that the proportion of graduate students, if we include students in professional faculties with a first degree, will be close to 40%.

We are rightly now giving first priority to the strengthening of our graduate schools; and we are aided in this by a sympathetic Provincial government. The first essential is to realize the special cost of graduate work. A good research library, for instance, is in the main a charge against the graduate school. Of the total of approximately two and a half million dollars that we spend annually on our library, about 70% is for the support of graduate studies and research. Half the time of a senior professor may be taken up in the supervision of a few doctoral dissertations. Most of the expensive equipment in the sciences is for the graduate work.

Having established graduate studies on a solid basis, we must, if we are to aspire to greatness, make sure that the undergraduate basis is not weakened. There are two rules here. The undergraduate course must not be looked upon as a pause before one plunges into the real work of graduate or professional education. It must not be crippled by shifting a preparatory programme to the first year of University or decapitated by converting the final year into graduate specialization. In the second place, all members of the teaching staff (with rare exceptions) should give some undergraduate instruction. A university that keeps its distinguished scholars out of sight of undergraduates is surely not a great university. I always remember a personal experience that brought this home sharply. My first classes in history were taught by a dedicated young specialist who deadened us with minutiae and puzzled us with a complicated bibliography. By Christmas I was coming to the conclusion that this dark, tangled university world was not for me. Then with the first lecture of the new term, the sun suddenly rose. The head of the department—at that time, it was Chester Martin, the distinguished Canadian historian—took over the class, and began to ask and to suggest answers to some general philosophical questions. Only a mature scholar could have raised these questions and discussed them in a way that was helpful to freshmen. I have never forgotten that experience, and I am determined that the modern freshman will not be denied it.

The third characteristic of the great university is that it maintains a balance between its long-range goals and its short-range obligations, or between its responsibility to pure scholarship and its responsibility to the society of which it is a part. More and more in this country our national life resolves itself into a number of problems to be solved. How can French Canada secure the kind of society it requires for the satisfaction of its aspirations, and yet remain a full member of a Confederation? How can we stimulate trade with the United States without being swallowed up politically by that country? How can we make sure that our cities develop harmoniously without strangling themselves? And there are many others. As this consciousness of problems develops, so will society seek help and direction from centres of learning.

Every day I read in the papers or in my increasingly mountainous correspondence that the University should undertake a special task: it should train actors and scene painters, devise courses for insurance executives, provide an immediate solution for parking, traffic, slum clearance, juvenile delinquency and town planning, become the artistic conscience of the nation and elevate the standards of public taste. It is flattering to be thought of as the great cornucopia of wisdom, as official town planner for the New Jerusalem, as, at one and the same time, the guardian and expositor of the past and the avant-garde of the avant-garde. But the great university will be selective about what it does in the area of immediate social pressure, and it will insist upon responding in ways that draw upon its own strength. The structure that the university has worked out is the centre or institute, and interdisciplinary grouping, utilizing scholars in the basic disciplines, and concentrating largely on the development of graduate work and research. Since the end of the Second World War the University of Toronto has established 11 of these centres or institutes. Five of these (known as Institutes) are in the Sciences: Aerospace Studies; Computer Science; Great Lakes research; Earth Sciences; and Biomedical Electronics. Six of these (known as Centres) are in the Humanities and Social Sciences: Criminology; Medieval Studies; Russian and East European Studies; Urban Studies; Industrial Relations; Culture and Technology. Two of these—Aerospace Studies and Computer Science—are already mature centres of scholarship, in each case the Canadian Headquarters of a branch of science that will profoundly affect the course of human development. One—Medieval Studies—is a coordination of resources in scholarship and materials that has for a long time



made Toronto an international centre of medieval studies. All of these centres and institutes are at the advancing boundaries of new knowledge. Some are moving out to deal with immediate problems: Criminology has sponsored conferences that have brought together for the first time in our history the Chief Justices of the Provinces and of the Supreme Court for the discussion of basic problems in sentencing. Russian and East European Studies has successfully initiated the first student exchange between Russia and Canada. Never in its history has the University of Toronto been so directly engaged in the problems of its time!

There is a fourth characteristic of the great university that is the hardest to define and the most difficult to realize. That is the maintenance of a sense of community. It is the consciousness in a university that, despite the masonry and the intense pursuit of new learning, despite the going and coming to committees and conferences at home and abroad (I sometimes think that the best place for high-level seminars is the waiting-room in any international airport), despite the size and complications, human beings are engaged in activities that are important, pleasant, and exhilarating. This will not be easy to secure in the new multiversity, and we shall need to use all the resources at our disposal: the college and residential system; the deployment of staff so that no student is faceless and anonymous; improved techniques of orientation and counselling; an increasing recognition of the role that students and staff can play in reaching important decisions about the future of the university.

Our task at the University of Toronto is, in simplest terms, to satisfy as fully as possible these criteria for greatness. Is it possible to do this under present conditions? In one respect the conditions are more ideal than they have ever been before. We are in the midst of a programme of expansion that will see the doubling of enrolment between 1955 and 1975. I would not minimize the problems that come in the wake of rapid expansion. But I also point out that expansion brings enormous dividends. The most important of these is the improvement of the physical facilities. Take, for instance, the move of the three basic science departments, Physics, Chemistry and Zoology from old quarters to new. This is not simply an exchange of the decrepit for the glisteningly modern. It is an exchange of the inadequate, one might say the antique, for the ample and the advanced. The rapid growth of the Graduate School has sharply dramatized the need

for additional Library facilities, and as a result we are about to build a Research Library in the Humanities and Social Sciences that in boldness of design and provision of facilities will be unmatched on this continent. The Faculty of Medicine has undertaken to grow to a size beyond the average of large medical schools, but in so doing it will be equipped with a basic medical science complex that was never dreamt of even in its most euphoric moods. One can say, then, that expansion means a greatly improved physical plant.

You will have noticed, however, that the criteria for greatness must be interpreted in terms of staff rather than of physical facilities. How do we stand, then, in this vital area? We are doing reasonably well. Each year we are adding to the strength of our teaching staff. From an average of approximately 41 new staff a year we advanced this year to 90; and we are proposing to double this again. But there are enormous problems. The main one is the ludicrous inadequacy of research funds in this country. I examined recently the amount of money made available for research in a number of large American universities, and I discovered that at least six of them have total budgets for research in excess of the total budget for all purposes at the University of Toronto, which is the largest operating budget in Canadian universities. A colleague of mine estimated the relative research money made available in Canada and the United States in the area of Mathematics, which is so crucial these days to many areas of research. He discovered that the ratio between the United States and Canada is approximately 50 to 1. The irony here is that even much of the research money we have comes from American sources, so that when this dries up, as it has had a tendency to do in recent years, the disparity between our own resources and those of our neighbours is even greater. Without research money one cannot hope to attract good staff. Unless this situation is dramatically remedied, Canadian universities will drift into a position of permanent mediocrity.

When we turn to the special areas of interdisciplinary research that are so vital to our national well being, we find the same meagreness of resources. In the United States this is the area which is supported by private foundations and corporations as well as by government. In Canada private funds go mainly into capital projects. Private capital will always be attracted into this area, which has the appeal of the permanent and conspicuous; but I would hope it would increasingly flow into research and investigation. It is here that the private dollar can show the most dramatic results.

I am confident that we shall emerge from the present era of expansion with strengthened universities. I am confident that strength in higher education will be more widely distributed than ever before, and that the inequalities between regions will be progressively broken down. I am fearful, however, that we may settle for a good solid average widely distributed, with no peaks, no conspicuous deviations, no splendid concentration of scholarship, in short, with no really great universities. Canadians generally have preferred comfortable respectability and the good solid average to the excitement of extremes. We are highly skilled at devising controls that guarantee a rough equality. We love to cut down the tall lilies. Americans, on the other hand, with a tradition of explosive expansionism, can produce both the very bad and the very good. It would be difficult in Canada to find institutions of higher learning that lend themselves to comic treatment. We don't go in for courses on the art of cosmetics or the techniques of salesmanship. On the other hand, you will not find universities that on a comparative basis are as magnificently endowed as Harvard or Yale of Chicago or Columbia, nor will you find anywhere in Canada, again on a comparative basis, a concentration of international scholarship such as you have in any one of ten major American universities. I can think of no better way of quickening national life or of strengthening our voice on the international scene than by the development of a few institutions of higher learning of unequivocal excellence. Such institutions cannot be developed accidentally. They are not the offspring of piety or of tradition, even less of publicity or architecture. Their existence depends upon a combination of public and private planning and support, and their continued strength on the devotion of those, both within and without their halls, who know and love them.

# UNIVERSITY GOVERNMENT—TRENDS AND A NEW MODEL

by H. B. Mayo\*

## *Introduction*

This is obviously a transitional—even a critical—period in the life of Canadian universities. It is fair to say that until recently Canada had the minor universities appropriate to a small and immature country. We had, for the most part, small arts and science colleges—often of respectable quality—together with a few traditional professional schools.

Three specific points illustrate this thesis: (1) We had in Canada (and for that matter, still have) no really first class university libraries—if judged by international standards. California has two first class libraries (state-supported) with a somewhat smaller population than Canada. (2) We did not produce the graduate students to staff our universities. For graduate studies Canadians went abroad, chiefly to the U.S. and the U.K., and in addition we imported trained men—again chiefly from the U.S. and the U.K. (3) Canadian universities were not noted for their advanced research—except in an occasional field. Until quite recently, it was still possible to be surprised at hearing of Canadian scholars whose work was internationally recognized; that is, the few exceptions were indeed exceptions.

This general picture is however changing rapidly and is likely to change still more rapidly in the future. For one thing, our universities are growing in size at a fantastic rate, and many new universities have been established. Even more significant is the changing nature of this growth. We are not merely adding more students to the kind of universities we had at the end of World War II, we are building universities very unlike those of former years. New faculties and professional schools are proliferating and large graduate programmes are being launched. Graduate work of all kinds is required of us, if only to satisfy the growing market demand for academic faculty. In addition, research expenditures are rising rapidly, and research is expanding into ever more fields. In short, our small, frugal colleges are being transformed into large multi-faculty universities.

---

\*University of Western Ontario.

Among the problems brought to the fore by this transformation of Canadian universities is that of university government. At the present time there is a ferment in Canadian universities, and indeed in those of Britain and the U.S.A. as well. Part of it arises from the changing nature of our universities (mentioned above), but part also arises from a widespread unrest over the past methods of university government and a consequent search for better ways.

The existence of the Duff Commission testifies to the spirit of faculty restlessness throughout the country, and to the willingness of university Boards and administrations to undergo a searching examination from outside. But whatever the recommendations of the Duff Commission may be, their benefit will be lost unless the universities are willing to undertake their own painful self-analysis. There is considerable evidence that faculties and faculty associations are more than willing to scrutinize their role in university government, but there is not very much to show that the Presidents and Boards of our universities would welcome changes that would lead to a diminution of their powers. Yet it is unlikely that the forms of government which we have inherited from the past will be satisfactory for the future.

#### *More faculty participation in university government*

In general, one suspects that university government will move more in the direction of faculty consultation and participation in major decision-making. University faculty, especially the better men who can obtain offers elsewhere, are about to ride the crest of a wave. Universities are already beginning to cannibalize one another. Departments are preparing dossiers on men who are ever so slightly "visible". This means that faculty in Canada, for the first time, will be treated with some deference; their requests and ideas will be attended to; they will no longer be pushed around by administrators and Boards, and held like cousin Amy in Locksley Hall (to paraphrase) as "Something better than a dog, a little dearer than a horse". As the concept of an academic profession receives wider acceptance, and as universities loom larger in the life of the country, so will faculty cease to be content with the negligible role in university government to which the traditional system has assigned them.

One of the several reforms now being widely discussed is that of faculty representation on Boards of Governors. This recommendation, if properly carried out, could (not necessarily would) make it easier to bridge the present gulf between faculty and "upper management".



The case for faculty representation on Boards has been well argued—e.g., by Mr. Justice Freedman in *C.A.U.T. Bulletin* (October Issue, 1964); and by Professor M. Donnelly in *A Place of Liberty* (Toronto, 1964). In these arguments the faculty representation is conceived to be minority representation: to bring faculty views to the Board. It is a very small mouse to be produced by a mountain of labour.

A second change would be to make most of the existing Senates really academic Senates, i.e., to reduce their size to 30 or 40 with a majority of faculty (non-administrators), with some enlargement of the powers of Senate vis à vis the Boards, and with perhaps the establishment of a series of Senate-Board committees.

Such changes in Boards and Senates, and in the relation between them, would doubtless be a considerable improvement upon existing forms. Most faculty members would be probably settle for something like that, particularly if, in addition, the local Faculty Associations play a somewhat larger role. After all, only a minority of university faculty is actively interested in forms of government.

It can be argued however that a third change should accompany Board and Senate reform, namely one that alters the authority of the university President. In my opinion, a common cause of discontent with university government in Canada is not only that the Board is a lay Board, but that the President is too often an unsatisfactory link between faculty and Board (and, one might add, between students and Board). A short analysis of the office of President is therefore relevant.

### *The office of university President*

To start with, one may put forward the hypothesis (slightly altered from the famous Commons resolution about George III) that "The power of the university President has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished".

A university president's position is one of power for several reasons:

(i) He is normally appointed by the Board. If he is accountable to anyone it is to the Board, not the faculty. At all costs he must "get on" with the Board, since his professional career is at stake. So are his salary and pension, and any directorships that may come his way,

and sometimes his further future—i.e., what job will be available to him when he “steps down”.

But the President is under no such pressures to “get on” with the faculty, who have no checks upon his power. The usual way in which faculty disapproval is expressed is by leaving for other positions, or by not applying for posts in the first place. The President can always explain away such disapproval (if he should be sensitive enough to recognize it) as “defects” in the character of particular faculty members.

(ii) The President is the channel of communication between faculty and Board. He can exclude faculty opinion and submissions, or screen them, and the Board has no alternative way of keeping in touch. In a similar way, he is the filter through which Board decisions reach the faculty. When he “speaks for the Board” there is no way of telling whether in fact the Board ever considered the matter. Too often a lay Board is blamed for decisions about which its members know nothing, and which are made by a President acting alone.

(iii) He is usually an academic and knows something of universities. Accordingly he is usually better informed on university affairs than Board members. His recommendations are thus likely to be followed. He is on virtually every Board committee, so he also knows Board business better than any other Board member. His intimate knowledge of the university is a source of great power.

(iv) Senior administrative appointments are *de facto* likely to be in his hands, in that the Board is likely to take his advice. By means of these appointments he can thus set the whole tone of university government. He can (and sometimes does) surround himself with amiable “yes-men”, who owe their position to him and are accountable to him. The temptation to make “easy” appointments for the sake of administrative harmony, as well as to “put across” his own policies, is a temptation very hard to resist.

(v) His exalted post leaves him inevitably isolated from faculty (and student) opinion. Such opinion as does percolate up to him is likely to be sporadic, unrepresentative, and unreliable. Thus his recommendations to the Board, and consequently Board decisions, appear to faculty and students alike as arbitrary, ill-founded, and irrational. This is especially so where the President lacks the good sense to work closely with the Faculty Association and Student Councils.

These general characteristics are more marked, and have worse effects, at some universities than at others. There are good Presidents and bad Presidents. But as currently played, there is hardly anything in the role of President to suggest that the actor is merely *primus inter pares*, or that he is responsible to the faculty. It cannot be denied that administration and policy-making are very highly centralized at some of our universities. The consequent alienation of faculty from President and Board is often very deep. Wherever this situation prevails, it is not possible to have good morale and a great university, no matter how benevolent the paternalism.

In summary, our traditional form of university government in Canada is likely to be modified along the following lines: The composition and powers of the lay Boards will be altered somewhat, Senates will become more academic and play a larger role in planning and policy-making, autocratic presidents where they exist will be replaced by others who will become increasingly responsible to faculty, and Faculty Associations will assume a larger and more assured role.

Is it possible to go further, to abandon entirely the traditional model of the lay Board as the supreme governing body? Such a fundamental change is at any rate worth thinking about, especially with the Duff Report pending, and given the likelihood that many university Statutes will be amended in the next year or two. I turn then to consider various "models" of university government.

#### *Possible "models" of university government*

(1) The first model can be rejected out of hand—that of the business corporation, with its Board of Directors (Governors) and its general manager (President), its Vice-presidents, its section and department heads, and its junior ranks arranged hierarchically.

I do not think many universities consciously adopt this model and defend it, but many act as if they believe in it. For instance, there is the up-grading (as in business) of administrators over academics, the senior administrative appointments being made without consultation with faculty, the handing down of important policies as fiats from the top, the employer-employee relationship, the spirit of hierarchy, etc. These and other defects of this model are conspicuously present in Canadian universities, possibly because the Boards, being composed largely of business men, unconsciously think in terms of the corporation model, and no one—least of all, the Presidents—has bothered to educate Board members otherwise.

The many differences between a business corporation and a university make this model almost totally inappropriate for the latter. It is offensive alike to university values and to faculty members.

(2) The second may be called the "colonial" model, and something like it is found in some provincial (and church-run) universities. The provincial government (or the church) stands for the imperial government, which appoints the President (Governor), while the Board of Trustees corresponds to the appointed Executive Council. In this model, there may be a limited *de facto* self-governing by faculty (corresponding to a colonial assembly with limited powers); but all important matters—finance, property, appointments, and major policy—are reserved to the Governor and his appointed Council. The natives (faculty) get restless after a time. Limited power and a little representation do not satisfy them. They come to believe in self-determination and democracy, because these doctrines are the ideology of the imperial country, and so they demand independence. The *university* gets independence from the state, but an oligarchy is left in charge, and the faculty never does get its democracy.

The model obviously does not fit our provincial universities closely. For instance, a colonial service (being a Civil Service) is somewhat more hierarchial than a university. And Canada has, by and large, a fairly good record of university independence from provincial government interference in its day to day operation and policy, even where the provincial cabinet appoints the President. We are fortunate that this is so, because to approach the "colonial" model very closely would destroy the much-valued tradition of university freedom from state "control".

(3) A third and superficially attractive model is that of Oxbridge. Scholars tend to view Oxbridge as an idealized self-governing "community of scholars", with a rotating Vice-Chancellorship, Hebdomadal Council, wine cellars, and all the rest of it. But Oxbridge is unique, and can never be established elsewhere if only because it is so expensive (requiring as it does many well-to-do colleges) and takes so many centuries to build.

The model is not feasible, even on the most optimistic assumptions, and must be rejected in Canadian circumstances. For that matter, the model is not followed by the other universities in Britain, and in this they show their wisdom.



The history of many of our universities is as follows: a "lay" body—made up of community leaders, business men, and so forth—sets out to establish a university. They raise money, obtain a charter, set up (or convert themselves into) a Board of Governors, appoint a President and, presto, they are "in business". (Note how our very language betrays us into use of the corporation model.)

These public-spirited citizens who found universities deserve every credit—without them, many Canadian universities would not exist. But when they have set up "in business" what model have they adopted? The answer of course is the American-type model with which we are all familiar: the lay Board (with, in Canada, often only a perfunctory nod towards faculty in the Senate). The model is obviously not exactly like the corporate or colonial models mentioned earlier, but it resembles them very much.

To whom is such a lay governing Board responsible? If the university can be financially independent, the Board can be self-perpetuating, and is responsible directly to no one. Even when public funds are granted to such a university, or even in the case of a provincial university, the Board is usually only indirectly accountable to the government. Is it not odd that lay Boards and Presidents do not regard themselves as in any way responsible to the faculty? Or that the faculty may have no more share in governing a university than if the "colonial" or corporation models were followed?

Such questions challenge the very principle of lay Boards for universities. And it becomes possible to do so today, because the historic rationale for the existence of lay Boards—that of raising the money—is being rapidly undermined. Before considering an alternative however, we must first seek the principles which will guide us in creating an appropriate model.

#### *Principles guiding university government*

(1) The first principle is that a university be recognized as *sui generis*, so that models drawn from other institutions are unlikely to be suitable.

I resist the temptation of saying much about the purposes (objectives, goals, functions) of universities, since it is only too easy to talk nonsense. At a minimum however we must say (a) they educate *adults* (the analogy with schools for children must be rejected), providing both general education and usually specialized and professional



education as well; and in all cases theoretical knowledge; (b) they pursue knowledge at the frontiers—in research (scholarship). It is an educational and intellectual enterprise at a high level that we are talking about, not a popular kind of “adult education”. Universities may (and do) add other functions to their teaching and research and their may be no objection to this, but they are not at the heart of the university and its values. (E.g., it may add technology to science, business administration to economics, domestic “science” to chemistry, etc. Yet one may say of a good university what Sir Richard Livingstone said of a good schoolmaster, he “is known by the number of valuable subjects he declines to teach”.)

(2) The model which is especially unsuitable for the university is the business model, with its criteria of “efficiency”, etc., yet this is the model most closely imitated today, whether by private or provincial universities. It has been the easy model to adopt: it is readily understandable by businessmen, the Americans do it, and we borrow easily and often unthinkingly from that source. The wonder is that under this model our universities have become as good as they are, although we ought not to delude ourselves that we have many (if any) first rate universities comparable to the best in the U.S.A. And the better the American university the more it seems to move, in practice, away from the corporation model.

(3) The distinction between “educational” policy and “other” policy (finance, property, etc.) is one that is impossible to maintain. University matters *are* educational; the others are subordinate and exist only to further the educational. The university exists for its educational purposes, and these have financial implications: this is the order of priority in which to approach university government in both our thinking and our practice.

What buildings to put up, their lay-out, and in what priority; what departments or faculties to expand, how to allocate the budget, what kind of a library—these and a dozen other matters now regarded as administrative or financial, and so reserved for the lay Board, are pre-eminently educational.

(4) Educational matters should be decided on educational grounds, by those who know most about them, and who are committed to them, that is to say by the faculty. The financial aspects are secondary, though of course vital. The people who know universities best, from the inside, are the faculty.

It would seem to follow that the most suitable model is one where the governing body (by whatever name) and the President (by whatever name) is responsible to the faculty, instead of the other way round as at present. The indirect responsibility to society (whatever meaning is given to this phrase) can be as easily performed in this model as in any other. Not many would argue against a faculty-run university on the ground that faculty would be "irresponsible", or less "responsible" than a group of businessmen. Faculty members share in the life of the community, mix with the public, act as consultants, and in many other ways are sensitive to local, provincial and national currents of thought.

(5) It would seem to follow that "lay" Boards should be abolished, and the governing body of a university be composed mainly of faculty members.

Two obvious objections may be made to this: *One* is that the Board has other functions (besides governing the university), namely, to raise money—either from private or public sources; and *the other* that a lay Board is needed to "manage" the finances and render an accounting to someone (by issuing reports, etc., to governments, donors, and the public).

As to raising money, my point is that lay Boards are rapidly becoming unnecessary in carrying out this function. Any university head, and his advisers in the university, can prepare budgets and plans and present them to the governments with requests for money. This in fact is how it is done now. The function has become easier to perform, and more formalized (i.e., less dependent on *personal* negotiation with governments) especially in Ontario, with the setting up of the University Affairs Advisory Committee, and the Department of University Affairs. The former seems to be growing more and more like a Finance and Planning Committee—the body intermediate between universities and government, to sift the universities' requests, to transmit them to governments, and to make the allocation among universities.

It is true many universities still make appeals to the general public for building funds, and to a lesser extent for operating revenue, but these fund drives need not be directed by a lay Board. Laymen interested in the university can always be called upon to help with fund raising. They are in fact called upon now. This marginal fund-raising

need carry with it no right to govern. (It is a highly debatable question whether Boards have performed well in the past in carrying out their duty of seeing that universities were adequately financed. It seems to me that more credit should go to governments than to Boards—especially in recent years.)

As to “managing” the finances, and rendering reports to governments, donors and public: accountants and other administrative officials are always available; so are auditors. Most of this work is done at present by university officers anyway.

I do not think it can be seriously argued that a lay Board is necessary for another reason, viz., to give governments and public the confidence that (in some way, unspecified) the university is “properly” run. (In any case, the points below meet this objection, if it is an objection.)

The more sophisticated objection to a faculty governing-body rests upon an analogy with politics. Just as Cabinet members are amateurs (in the sense of not being specialists in the functions of their Departments) so, it is argued, universities should be run by laymen-amateurs to act as trustees for society at large, to mediate faculty disputes, and—hovering disinterestedly above the battle—order the priorities and allocate the scarce resources.

In my judgment the analogy is misleading. A university is not (or should not be) hierarchially ordered on the model of a government Department. Still less is it a general government charged with whatever multitudinous purposes the voters wish it to serve. A university has a few specialized purposes—at their widest, education and scholarship. Nor, in a university, is the representative principle with direct accountability to the public all-important. (If it were, the case for a popularly-elected governing body would be unanswerable.) Nor, finally, can an active lay Board—any more than a Cabinet—remain aloof from the “battle”. Academics certainly have their full share of prejudices, but laymen too have their biases and pet projects. In summary, then, the special arguments that apply for an “amateur” Cabinet in political life, have no force when directed at university life.

(6) Nevertheless, somewhere, somehow, any model of university government ought to provide for “letting in” the public and/or government.

The reasons for admitting the public are to ensure direct contact with some of the public, to identify them with the university and its purposes, to give them some "inside" voice so that their views can be known, and to inform them about the university. This interest is fully catered for, if a voice is given in an advisory (or minority) capacity; but it need not be in a policy-making capacity, or we should be denying our earlier principles.

The claim that the government should be "let in" in the governing body may either be met in some way, or it may be refuted. I think it can be refuted. We must ask: What is the interest of the government in a university? Surely not to *run* the university in its educational and scholarly enterprise, or academic independence is destroyed; and so far as I know, no one advocates that the state should do this. The legitimate interest of the government (representing the society at large) is to ensure that the university meets or is responsive to social needs, i.e., that it admits and educates students, and carries on research and scholarship. This is just what university faculties *want* to do, and presumably know how to do.

Moreover, there are many ways in which governments can bring pressure to bear—the financial is the most obvious and efficacious. So long as universities depend on public money—which will be forever, so far as we can see—the government has a very powerful weapon in its hands. Our difficulty today, and it will be more acute in the future, is not how to bring governments into the university, but how to keep them out and preserve academic freedom, while the university depends on them for money.

I think too, that a faculty governing body is in a much better position to inform governments about university affairs than are lay Boards. At present, there is no dialogue between university faculty and Government, but only one between a "lay" Board and a "lay" Government.

If, in spite of this refutation, it is still felt that government should have a finger in the pie, then let it be as for members of the public, i.e., let government appointees act in an advisory capacity. (It is worth noting that because of the Canadian constitution, the federal government, despite its financial aid to universities, has never lodged a claim for appointees on Boards.)

*A possible model for a faculty-run university.*

The main guiding principles having been laid down, I now proceed to sketch a rough model. Since I am not drafting a statute, it is hardly necessary to go into details.

1. The governing body of a university should be composed mainly of faculty. It should be given some such name as Senate, to underline that it carries no overtones of the corporation model, and to get away from the present terminology of "Governors" and the like.

It is a comparatively easy matter to arrange for staggered terms of office for faculty Senators (say 3 years), for their election by faculty members, and so on. One point to emphasize is that long terms of office should be avoided in order not to take academics away from their proper work too long.

2. To the Senate (the governing body) would be added a number of representatives of the public and (possibly) some government appointees and (possibly) some faculty members from other universities. *In toto*, these would be a minority on the Senate.

This would ensure that the voices of government and public are heard, but that they would exert influence instead of domination. Appointment to the Senate would also provide honorific positions and the title of Senator—to satisfy those who believe that the universities should perform the social function of providing "titles".

3. I would envisage the Senate as a very formal body, meeting say 4 times a year, to establish major policies and to ratify the budget and the major policy recommendations made by its smaller Executive Committee. The total Senate would perhaps comprise 40 persons, of which 30 would be academics (or 30 of which 20 would be academics).

4. The Senate would have full powers of policy making over all matters, financial, property, and the rest. It would thus combine the functions of present Boards with those of the present so-called academic "Senates". In this way, the artificial distinction between educational and other policies would be broken down, by bringing all under one authority, and by emphasizing the logical priority of the educational.

5. The Senate would have the power (and would be compelled by pressure of work) to delegate decision in many matters, more or less as now. A system of faculty councils could, as now, recommend on curriculum, course changes, establishment of departments, etc.



6. There would be a smaller, more manageable Executive Committee of the Senate, say a half dozen members. These would be chosen from among the Senate's own members (mostly from faculty), and so would the Chairman of the Senate. The Executive Committee would meet frequently—monthly, and otherwise as required. Within the framework of major policy set by the Senate, the Executive would make decisions. Other Senate Committees—including advisory committees—could easily be set up as required, to study, to recommend, etc., and appointed members (from the public) could be added to these special committees as now. (Students should also be added, and their voice heard more than under the existing system.)

A term on the Senate, and its Executive, would normally be regarded by faculty members as a duty to be undertaken once or twice in a life-time. (Indeed the only really serious objection to this whole model is that it would take up so much time of teachers and scholars.)

7. There would be as now a Chancellor, a position of great honour but not power. He would be elected by all graduates (i.e., all with a first degree), as is already done by several Canadian universities.

8. The administrative head would be a Vice-Chancellor (not "President") appointed by the Senate *either* on recommendation of the faculty, *or* with the faculty having a veto on the choice. He would attend (as non-voting member) Senate, Executive, etc., meetings. His term of office would be for 5 years, subject to renewal for a second period of 5 years.

He would thus clearly be a professional administrator, usually with an academic background. It is impossible, I think, to imagine anything less than a full-time appointee filling this demanding position. He would, of course, have administrative assistants to help him, and there may be vice-presidents, but none labelled "administrative". Part of the philosophy built into this model is to avoid a hierarchial system that elevates the administrative career and its values above the academic. The "academic culture" has, and should have, little place for heroes of administration. The Vice-Chancellor's duties would be very similar to those of an existing "President", but he would no longer "mete and dole unequal laws unto a savage race".

9. All other senior administrative appointments would be made by the Executive, again upon faculty recommendation. In the case of non-academic administrative appointments—bursar, engineer, etc.—ad hoc

special committees would recommend; in the case of deans and principals and departmental chairman, etc., whose terms of office would not be permanent, but for a term of say, 3 years, an ad hoc faculty committee would recommend. Insofar as possible, the principle of election—even if indirect—should be incorporated into the appointing machinery, in order to maintain the flow of legitimating authority, upwards from faculty. The rotation in office of academic administrators has the advantage of giving them all “honorable exits”.

10. Academic appointments would be made roughly as is done now in some universities—i.e., on department recommendations, by the Executive of the new Senate. For senior appointments the recommendation should come from a faculty committee upon which should sit at least one member from a related department.

11. The role of the Faculty Association would not diminish under this model but would in fact be enhanced, and in some respects changed. E.g., it would form the body to conduct elections to the Senate, to form the committee to recommend an appointee as Vice-Chancellor, and (perhaps) to recommend the non-permanent academic administrators (deans, etc.); it would work out (with the Senate) all conditions of employment. It would also have a continuing role of importance in studying and recommending on any university matter whatever.

It goes without saying that the model would have to be modified somewhat for the complexities of a “unique, huge and multifarious” university. It would also be modified slightly where there are “affiliated” colleges. But close adherence to the guiding principles could, I think, be maintained.

12. If it is desired to join the public closer to the life of the university, this may be achieved by establishing a body—say a Council or Court—with representatives drawn from alumni, counties, cities, secondary schools, professional organizations, etc. This body could meet once or twice a year, enjoy a university dinner, listen to university reports, propose resolutions, make recommendations, etc. It would have influence, but not power. (The election of a few members to the Senate might be one of the functions of this Body.)

Is this possible model a good one? I am not sure. I have no great faith in the ability of academics to govern a university wisely. Academics, beside having the common human frailties, have the added curse

of highly trained intelligence, so that they can more easily find things to disagree about. They are like Milton's fallen angels. But neither have I any great faith in the ability of lay Boards and autocratic Presidents to govern wisely. In fact I have less faith in the latter group. As with a democratic political system, one does not defend the suggested model because it is ideal, but because the defects of alternative systems are worse. In politics one is accustomed to choosing the lesser evil.

We have today in Canada universities of a given quality—mostly second rate, and some poorer. No one can prove that, under lay Boards, they are as good as they might have been, or that they would have been better or worse under faculty government. It is an open question. We can see what *has* been done, but not what *might have* been done. To me, however, there is a *prima facie* case that the faculty government model will do better by Canada in the future. I agree with Sir Eric Ashby that "nothing short of constitutional change will fit the universities for the expansion they have undertaken".

Is the model feasible? No, I do not think so. It is too new, too great a break with our traditions, and too many vested interests stand in the way of its adoption. But somebody ought to be arguing for this extreme form, if only to counter the weight of inertia and interests and fallacious arguments that favour a continuation of the status quo. What a pity it is that none of the newer universities set up in recent years has shown enough imagination to try the faculty run model.

## THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR UNIVERSITY TEACHERS PURSUING ADVANCED STUDIES

It is generally, if not universally agreed, within the Canadian academic community that the Doctor of Philosophy is the terminal degree for members of university faculties, with the possible exception of some posts at professional schools. It is surprising to note therefore, in the 1963-64 figures of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, that 55% of 8,937 teachers in Canadian universities and colleges do not possess the Ph.D. Thus one out of two members of our university and college teaching community do not possess the terminal qualifications, and it is certain that under the present conditions most of these faculty members will never possess it.

It is of course, unrealistic to maintain that all faculty members of every university and college should possess a doctorate. There are a certain percentage who through reasons of age, interest or even ability would not, and in some cases should not, attempt to qualify for the Ph.D. There is as well, however, a sizable percentage of non-doctoral faculty members who desire the degree, and who have the ability and interest to attain it, but who are severely handicapped by a lack of finances. Those who make up this able but financially handicapped group are those who are married with one or more children, thus precluding the possibility of financial assistance from a working wife. A particular and considerable segment of this group are those who are further handicapped by being over thirty years of age, and because of this fact much less eligible for scholarship funds.

An interest in this situation by some members of the C.A.U.T. resulted in a motion to the Council that the matter be studied. As a result the Committee on Financial Assistance for University Teachers Pursuing Advanced Studies was set up in February of 1964. Its terms of reference included, in addition to evaluating the situation, the study of present sources of assistance and other possibilities, and the making of recommendations to the Executive.

Since its inception the Committee has presented reports at the June and November Council meetings. The latter report gave the results of a survey of non-doctoral members from a sampling of Canadian university faculties. The results of the survey, conducted at six Atlantic

universities (selected so as to do one area in depth), two Ontario universities and one university from the west, showed that 50% or more of the non-doctoral members at each of these universities were married with one or more children. At least 75% of the non-doctoral members at each of these universities were over thirty years of age.

The Committee also reported on its study of the present sources of assistance in terms of available scholarships and fellowships. There is of course a great variety and proliferation of these assistances. In general it can be said that the majority provide sums of between \$1,200 and \$3,000 per year with the average being nearer to \$2,000. A good number state an age limit which is usually thirty to thirty-five years of age. It is apparent that many others which do not state an age limit would actually possess one due to the conditions of eligibility, as many are awarded on the basis of undergraduate performance without consideration or allowance for an interruption in training.

It is obvious that such assistances as are presently available are designed for the candidate without dependents, and in fact are sufficient to just about underwrite his yearly expenses. For the married man with dependents, however, such a sum, and the candidate over thirty is likely not to get even this, will cover not even half his yearly expenses. Any amount of assistance is valuable but if we are to encourage faculty members to pursue advanced studies the present types of assistance are quite inadequate for the married man with dependents.

There are those who would argue that a faculty member who wants a higher degree and who has the ability and the interest to attain it should do so regardless of cost. The cost, however, can be inhibitory. Since most scholarships are in the neighbourhood of \$2,000, and since it is unlikely that a married man with two children can live for less than \$5,000 per year, even in a restricted manner, he is out of pocket \$3,000 a year. Add to this the loss of income, which can amount to \$5,000 per year for the man making \$7,000, and it gives a loss per year of \$8,000. Extended over 2½ to 3 years the overall cost of obtaining the degree would be in the neighbourhood of \$20,000. The figures of course are hypothetical, but an amount anywhere in this range is bound to deter all but the most determined of the determined. It is obvious that most people faced with this choice will forgo the advanced study, and in most cases, not due to selfishness but due to an unwillingness to subject their families to such financial rigours on top of the emotional ones often incurred in advanced study.



The point will also be raised that faculty members should not allow themselves to be in a situation where they have acquired dependents and financial obligations before they have finished their training. Perhaps this is so, but the pattern will doubtless continue to exist where a graduate student accepts a university appointment before full qualification, often as a result of marital or financial circumstances, intending to finish at a later date. There is even evidence that the percentage doing this will increase as universities dig deeper and deeper to find even partially trained personnel to fill the lower instructional posts. Once committed to such a position, the individual may find himself trapped in that he cannot finance the completion of his training and yet because of this lack he cannot become eligible for the higher teaching posts. His choice is either to resign himself to the status of the lesser-qualified professor or else leave the teaching profession entirely.

Some universities have the practice of providing some financial assistance to faculty members pursuing advanced degrees. In almost all cases this involves a commitment by the faculty member to return to teach at that university for a minimum number of years. There are a number of reasons why this scheme is unsuitable from the viewpoint of both parties. Not the least of these reasons is the loss of mobility by the faculty member, often at a very critical period in his career.

The authors are well aware of the arguments for and against the doctoral degree, and will readily admit that the obtaining of the degree does not automatically make the holder a better scholar or a better teacher. It does, however, make him a better qualified one and cannot help but give him a greater knowledge of some area of his field of specialization. It is an unusual situation where the effort involved in acquiring the doctorate does not bring to the aspirant a considerable amount of stimulation in his teaching and research. Further, on the purely practical level it is obvious that the great bulk of advancements within university faculties go only to holders of the Ph.D. Indeed in many departments of our universities the doctorate is required to qualify for even the lowest category of faculty status.

What our committee has in mind to recommend, is that a certain amount of money be set aside for the express purpose of encouraging and assisting non-doctoral faculty members to qualify for advanced studies. This assistance could be made available in more than one form, but underlying the program would be a reasonable scale of dependents'

allowances and a more relaxed age limit. The sources of the funds are still being studied. It is certain, however, if the need is authentic and obvious enough that the funds will be found.

There are those who will say that some non-doctoral faculty members unsuited by ability or interest for advanced study will regard this scheme as an opportunity to take a few years vacation from their academic duties. A simple calculation will show, however, that the increased aid envisioned can by no means underwrite anything like the full costs, but will only lessen the severe financial burden.

We are all aware of the present and ever-increasing shortage of qualified university faculty, and of the drastic demand for more and more personnel. We are making considerable efforts as an academic community to encourage promising students to join us. Surely a reasonable extension of this program would be an equal if not greater effort to assist those who have already chosen an academic career as their life's work to obtain full qualification.

On both occasions when the work of this committee has been discussed at the C.A.U.T. Council meetings there has been shown at best only a polite interest by most of the representatives from the various Locals. It may be that in spite of our sampling the situation we wish to improve is not a significant problem at most universities. If there is no enthusiastic interest in the Committee's work then it is unlikely that any recommendations brought forward will accomplish anything of value.

The purpose of this article then is to bring the matter to the attention of the general membership and to ask, as sincerely as we are able, for an expression of opinion on our task. Kindly send your comments directly to the Committee at St. Francis Xavier University or to the C.A.U.T. Executive Secretary.

Robert P. Thompson, Chairman,  
Biology Department,  
St. Francis Xavier University,  
Antigonish, Nova Scotia.

Edward J. Monahan,  
Philosophy Department,  
St. Francis Xavier University,  
Antigonish, Nova Scotia.

## BRIEF TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON BROADCASTING

Submitted by The Canadian Association of University Teachers

October 15, 1964.

I. The Canadian Association of University Teachers welcomes the opportunity to record and submit its views on Canadian broadcasting. Our Association, with forty-one member faculty associations at universities in all ten provinces and more than five thousand members, represents the great majority of the university teachers in Canada. The Association is concerned with and has studied practically all aspects of Canadian universities and has come to be recognized as a representative and well-informed body with regard to these matters.

Owing to its special concern with all matters pertaining to education, the Association is necessarily interested also in radio and television broadcasting. This interest was demonstrated in 1956 when the Association submitted a Brief to the Royal (Fowler) Commission on Broadcasting.

II. In drawing up the present submission the Association has been guided by the following considerations and principles:

The C.A.U.T. is keenly aware that radio and television are instruments of information and education as well as entertainment. In the providing of both information and education, it is obviously neither desirable nor possible, even in the most democratic society, to be guided by the tastes of the majority. The health of a democracy depends on the availability of the truthful and the excellent, even though these may sometimes also be unpleasant. In a modern democracy, where mass media have so pervasive an influence, the concern must be not merely to give the public what it wants or thinks it wants, but to give it what it deserves.

As a consequence, the Association believes that one of the functions of radio and television broadcasting is to bring to the attention of all Canadians issues of national interest, and that another of its functions is to continue and encourage the growth of certain more

serious elements in our culture even though these may attract relatively small audiences and require financial subsidization. The fulfilment of these functions is, the Association feels, consistent with the principle that it is desirable that the public have a broad choice of radio and television programmes.

Finally, the C.A.U.T. firmly adheres to the view that radio and television can most successfully fulfill these functions in an atmosphere of freedom from political control.

### III. Recommendations

In the light of the foregoing statements and of the developments of recent years in Canadian broadcasting, the C.A.U.T. respectfully presents the following recommendations:

1. The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, with its network of radio stations and television channels throughout the country, should be considered the national network, responsible for transmitting programmes which it considers to be of national interest.

The C.B.C. may work out collaborative arrangements regarding these programmes with private stations, but national programming should not be open to competitive bidding.

Affiliates of the C.B.C. should be released from such affiliation only in those localities in which the C.B.C. has adequate production facilities.

2. The C.B.C. should be granted sufficient assured financial resources to permit it to maintain itself as a national network, to transmit serious and worthwhile programmes that ordinarily require subsidization, and to take proper advantage of new technological developments affecting the efficiency and quality of production. Without suggesting that the C.B.C. be protected from criticism, it is nevertheless essential that the Corporation have adequate financial assurance extending considerably beyond one year. The effectiveness of the C.B.C. is not assisted in any way by dark threats to curtail drastically the Corporation's annual budget. Such threats, if in fact carried out, would cripple the unique contribution which the C.B.C. has been and is making towards Canadian unity and culture and towards providing quality public entertainment in this country.

3. The policy that the C.B.C. operate independently of political influence and that long-term financing of the C.B.C. be assured to encourage such independence should be reaffirmed.

In support of the latter recommendation it should be noted that Parliament has so far failed to act on the recommendation of the 1957 Fowler Report that parliamentary grants to the C.B.C. be made for five-year periods. This proposal is consistent not only with the objective of freedom from political influence but also with principles of sound corporate financing.

It should be noted also that, as the C.B.C. would be far more vulnerable to political interference if it were to be fragmented into two or more separate networks, it is necessary to reaffirm the desirability of broadcasting remaining a federal responsibility.

To help in achieving the objective of freedom from political influence every effort should be made to ensure that appointments to the Board of Broadcast Governors are not made on the basis of political patronage.

Finally, it would be desirable that a permanent committee be established to ensure, as far as possible, freedom of criticism on radio and television as well as freedom from political interference in general. This committee should be in a position to carry on research respecting these matters. The committee might well be composed of members representing the media, the universities and, possibly, a few other members of the Canadian public at large.

4. The Board of Broadcast Governors should review the applications of radio and television stations to determine whether the pledges made in their applications have been upheld. The B.B.G. should not hesitate to revoke the licenses of those stations that have violated their pledges without adequate explanation.

5. The Board of Broadcast Governors, while continuing to recognize the national network roles assigned to the C.B.C., should continue to have general regulatory powers. The specific regulations governing programme and advertising content should be the same for all stations.

6. The C.B.C. and the private stations should continue to compete for sponsors and for audiences. The principle should be reaffirmed that the C.B.C. continue to be responsible for commercially sponsored



programmes. Advertising agencies that wish access to the Canadian market through the C.B.C. must accept C.B.C. standards of programming. Further, while the C.B.C. has a responsibility to provide suitable programming for the variety of tastes in Canada, it should also be observed that there is a distinction between "commercialism" and quality programmes which provide commercial revenue.

7. Special incentives should be provided to English language radio and television stations to experiment with French language programmes which deal with the culture of French Canada. The resources of universities to conduct research on such experiments should be made use of, and grants for such research should be made available.

8. Educational broadcasting should be encouraged and adequately subsidized. As the areas where this need is most acute often have difficulties in reception, the practice of transmitting such programmes on AM radio and VHF television bands should be continued. This does not preclude the use of FM radio and UHF television bands, but the intent of this recommendation is contrary to the suggestion often made that all educational broadcasting be placed on FM and UHF bands.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

## SELECTED FRINGE BENEFITS AVAILABLE IN 1965 AT CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES<sup>1</sup>

Witold Weynerowski\*

The data charts appended to this article give information about the more important "fringe" or non-salary benefits available to full-time faculty at some thirty-five Canadian universities and colleges.<sup>2</sup> The following paragraphs make no attempt to summarize the data, which speak for themselves. It may, however, be useful to comment briefly on some recent trends and developments in the whole range of fringe benefits and particularly within some specific categories.

Having been engaged over the past two years in gathering and analysing up-to-date information about this multi-faceted subject, I have been struck by the widespread improvements during this period. These improvements have particularly affected retirement benefits and the various types of insurance schemes.

It should be stressed also that many of the more notable improvements reflect to a very large extent the initiative and dedication of exceedingly well-briefed faculty committees. Such committees enabled McGill and Waterloo, for example, to set up first-rate package plans of group insurance. The new McGill group insurance plan which could well serve as a model for many other institutions, includes the following benefits, all underwritten by the same company: life insurance; insurance against accidental death and dismemberment; health insurance; long term disability benefit.<sup>3</sup> To judge by the chart, a number of universities and colleges offer group insurance schemes (either deficient in some way or) generally inferior to those of both McGill and Waterloo.

---

\*Research Assistant in the C.A.U.T. national office.

<sup>1</sup> The data listed in the charts (see pages 36-45) were submitted in February of this year to faculty associations for correction and up-dating. Their accuracy is dependent on the replies received.

<sup>2</sup> The different benefits taken up in the charts are: pensions, group life insurance; long term disability or income continuance insurance; surgical medical insurance; hospital insurance; paid sick leave; remission of tuition fees for faculty children; sabbatical leave; mortgage loans and housing; research, travel and moving grants.

<sup>3</sup> Furthermore the McGill and Waterloo insurance package provisions, including amount of benefit and of shared university-participant costs, are clearly and fully spelled out in a special booklet issued to all participants.

As already indicated, much progress has been made over the past two years within each of the individual group insurance categories. In group life insurance, at many universities, face values have risen to a satisfactory level.<sup>4</sup> Virtually all institutions offer surgical medical insurance schemes, with the university often paying at least half the cost.<sup>5</sup> Increasingly, too, drugs and psychiatric treatment are covered in plans offering major medical provisions. Finally, many institutions have quite recently adopted long-term disability insurance schemes, and Memorial, York and Mount Allison are currently considering such a step. In this respect also, the situation has improved greatly since 1963 when the C.A.U.T. Executive and Finance Committee considered for a time the setting up of a national long-term disability plan for all faculty wishing to purchase such insurance at low-cost group rates. Nevertheless, while it is true that many universities have recently adopted good disability schemes (note particularly the University of Saskatchewan scheme, which is perhaps the best in the country), at least twelve institutions, including McMaster, Toronto, Queen's, Montreal, Dalhousie and U.N.B., have still not provided their staff with protection against the low-incidence but potentially calamitous occurrence of prolonged physical disability.

The most encouraging and widespread up-grading has been evident in pension plans. The money-purchase type of plan continues to give way to the unit-purchase or fixed formula type of plan, so that at present almost all the larger universities and almost all the universities and colleges in the West and in the Atlantic provinces offer unit-purchase plans *often with benefits tied to final or highest earnings*.<sup>6</sup>

A bright new dawn in Canadian university pensions came with the pioneering efforts of Laval, which in 1961 produced a pension plan with a final earnings formula guaranteeing persons with 35 years service a pension equal to 60% of final salary. In 1964 the University of Alberta unveiled a plan which is perhaps the finest retirement

---

<sup>4</sup> This form of insurance is especially valuable as it often includes a disability provision that pays non-taxable benefits in case of permanent disability.

<sup>5</sup> Many universities, on the other hand, do not contribute anything towards the premiums payable under their surgical-medical plans.

<sup>6</sup> In recent years Queen's, Laval and Alberta have changed from money-purchase to unit-purchase plans. Saskatchewan is on the point of doing the same thing. There are indications that still other universities will follow. This move is explained by the fact that money-purchase type benefits are, in effect, based on average career earnings, and therefore tend to provide inadequate pensions for persons recently retired or persons now close to retirement. The final earnings type of unit purchase plan is much less vulnerable to the effects of inflation.

scheme on this continent. The Alberta plan, like that at Laval, is the product of much work by faculty as well as administration. It offers satisfactory vesting provisions, with post-retirement adjustments of benefits based on actuarial reviews not less frequent than every three years, and the following basic formula: 2% of average salary during the highest 5 years of pensionable service times the number of years of pensionable service.<sup>7</sup>

While numerous deficiencies and divergencies continue to exist among Canadian university pension and insurance schemes, the country-wide improvements which have occurred are welcome signs that these matters are at least being actively attended to.

The same progress has not occurred with respect to sabbatical leave and grants towards research. Anyone familiar with the C.A.U.T. policy statement on sabbatical leave, or aware of sabbatical leave policies in the United States or Australia, will know how much remains to be done in this country to provide for this necessary condition of academic life. As for policies to encourage research, such policies, far from being merely inadequate, are often ephemeral and would occasionally appear to be left completely undefined, in a state equivalent to official non-existence.

---

<sup>7</sup> The announced C.U.F.-C.A.U.T.-C.A.U.B.O. study on Canadian university pension plans will undoubtedly provide considerable further stimulus to the reform already achieved in this area.

# PENSIONS

"Sir Geo. Wms. is not listed. Its plan is under negotiation. No reply from Jean de Brebeuf.

	1 "Fixed Pension" Plan? What rate of earnings?	2 "Money Purchase" Plan? What rate of earnings?	3 Any supplement to persons on retirement?	4 Contributions made by: a) Individual b) Institution	5 Institution's contribution vested in individual?	6 Any special provision against inflation?	7 Does Institution guarantee married persons a \$4,000 pens.?	8 Does Institution match additional voluntary contribu- tions by individuals?	9 Any provisions to cover long-term disability?
Alberta	Yes, 2% of highest 5 years	—	No	a) 6% of sal. b) 6% of sal.	Yes	Yes (final earnings feature & 3 yr actuarial reviews)	No	No	(Separate plan)
Bishop's	Yes, 2% of highest 10 years after age 37 plus 1% for every year before 37	—	Yes (ad hoc)	a) 3% age 27-36 6% age 37-66 b) bal. required	Fully vested only after 10 years service	Yes (final earnings feature)	No	No	No
Brandon	Yes, 2% of ave. career earnings	—	Yes (ad hoc)	a) 6% of sal. b) bal. required	Only after age 35	No	No	No	Yes
Carleton	—	Yes	No	a) 5% of sal. b) 7% of sal.	Yes	Yes	No	Yes, partially (if projected pension falls below auth. min.)	(Separate plan)
Dalhousie	Yes, 2% of highest 5 years	—	Yes (ad hoc)	a) 6% of sal. b) bal. required	Only after 20 yrs service (sliding scale starting after 8 yrs)	Yes (final earnings feature)	No	No	No
Guelph	Yes, 2% of highest 3 years	—	No	a) 6% of sal. b) bal. required	Only after 10 yrs service	Yes (final earnings feature)	No	No	Yes (after 10 yrs. service)
Lakehead	Yes, 1.5% of highest 100th months	—	No	a) 6% of sal. b) bal. required (pair by prov. govt.)	N/A	Periodic adjustments	No	No	Yes (after 15 yrs. service)
Laurentian	Yes, 1.5% of highest 5 years	—	No	a) 5% of sal. b) bal. required	Yes	No	No	No	No
Laval	Yes, 1.7% of last 5 years	—	No	a) 6% of sal. b) bal. required (6% of sal.)	Yes (after 5 years service)	Yes (final earnings feature)	No	No	Yes
Loyola	—	Yes	No	a) 5% of sal. b) 5% of sal.	Yes	No	No	No	(Separate plan)
Manitoba	Yes, 2% of ave. career salary	—	Yes (formula)	a) 6% of sal. b) bal. required (6% minimum)	Yes	No	No	No	(Separate plan)
McGill	—	Yes	Yes (formula, after 15 years service)	a) 5% of sal. b) 5% of sal. (7½% after age 40)	Yes	No	No	No	No
McMaster	Yes, 2% of ave. career earnings	—	Yes (formula)	a) 5% of sal. b) bal. required	Yes	No	No	No	Yes, if total and permanent
Memorial	Yes, 2% of highest 5 years (max. two- thirds of final salary)	—	Yes	a) 6% of sal. b) bal. required	No (under consideration)	Yes (final earnings feature)	No	No	Yes (after 10 yrs. service - still pending)
Montreal	Yes, 2% of ave. career earnings	—	Yes (ad hoc)	a) 5% of sal. b) bal. required	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes



Mt. Allison	No	Yes	Yes (ad hoc)	a) 6% of sal. b) $7\frac{1}{2}\%$ of sal.	Yes	Yes (GREF)	No	No	(Separate plan under study)
N.S. Tech.	Yes, 2% of highest 5 years	—	No	a) 6% (5% women) b) bal. required	No	Yes (final earnings feature)	No	No	Yes
Ottawa	—	Yes	No	a) 6% of sal. b) 6% of sal.	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Prince of Wales	Yes, 2% of highest 3 years	—	No	a) 6% of sal. b) bal. required	No	Yes (final earnings feature)	No	No	Yes (after 10 yrs. service)
Queen's	Yes, 2% of ave. career earnings	—	Yes (formula)	a) $7\frac{1}{2}\%$ of sal. b) bal. required	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Sask.	Under Negotiation								
St. Francis Xavier	Yes	Yes	Not to persons appointed since 1959	a) 5% of sal. b) 5% of sal.	Yes	Yes (GREF)	No	No	No
Sherbrooke	—	Yes	No	a) 5% of sal. b) $7\frac{1}{2}\%$ after 40	Yes	Yes	No	No	(Separate plan)
St. John's	Yes, 2% of ave. career earnings	—	No	a) 6% of sal. b) bal. required	Yes	No	No	No	No
St. Mary's	—	Yes	Ad hoc consideration	a) 5% of sal. b) 5% of sal.	Only after 10 yrs service	No	No	No	Yes
St. Paul's	—	Yes	Yes (ad hoc)	a) 5% of sal. b) 5% of sal.	Yes	Yes (GREF)	No	No	No
Toronto	Yes, 2% of ave. career earnings (min. 1.5% of highest 5 yrs)	—	Yes (if necessary) to achieve minimum	a) 5% of sal. b) bal. required	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
U.B.C.	—	Yes	Yes (formula)	a) 5% of sal. b) 10% of sal.	Yes	Yes (GREF)	Yes (ex gratia payments)	Yes (if projected pension falls below auth. min.)	(Separate plan)
U.N.B.	Yes, 2% of highest 3 years	—	No	a) 6% of sal. b) bal. required	No	Yes (final earnings feature)	No	No	Yes (after 10 yrs. service)
United	Yes, 2% of ave. career earnings	—	Yes (ad hoc)	a) 6% of sal. b) bal. required	Yes	No	—	No	(Separate plan)
Victoria	—	Yes	Yes (ad hoc)	a) 5% of sal. b) 10% of sal.	Yes	Yes (GREF)	—	No	(Separate plan)
Waterloo Lu.	—	Yes	Yes (ad hoc)	a) 6% of sal. b) 6% of sal.	Yes	Yes	No	No	(Separate plan)
Waterloo	Yes, 2% of ave. career earnings	—	Not yet arisen	a) 5% of sal. b) 5% of sal.	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Western	Yes, 2% of ave. career earnings plus final 10 years ave. earnings	—	Yes (ad hoc)	a) 6% of sal. b) bal. required	Yes	Yes (final earnings feature)	No	No	(Separate plan)
Windsor	Yes, 2% of ave. career earnings	—	No	a) 5% of sal. b) bal. required.	Partial vesting	No	No	No	No
York	Yes, 1.5% of highest 5 yrs or 2% of ave. career earnings (which-ever is higher)	—	Not yet arisen	a) 6% of sal. b) bal. required	Yes	No	No	No	Yes

# GROUP LIFE INSURANCE

## LONG TERM DISABILITY (INCOME CONTINUANCE) INSURANCE

	1 Does Institution offer group life insurance plan?	2 Which por. of tot. cost is paid by Institution?	3 What is the value of the plan?	4 Are disability provisions included in life insurance plan?	1 Is there a plan to cover total or permanent disability?	2 Does plan cover persons not perm. disabled, not able to carry on work?	3 What part of total cost is paid by university?	4 What is maximum period of benefits?	5 What is amount of benefits?
U.B.C.	Yes (compulsory)	50%	Unit schedule	No, but premiums waived if disabled	Yes (compulsory)	Yes	50%	to 65	50% of salary
Alberta	Yes (voluntary)	Nil	Max. lesser of 250% of sal. or \$40,000	No	Yes (compulsory)	Yes	33%	to 65	60% of sal. up to max. \$1,000 per month (and waiver of pension prem.)
Sask.	Yes (compulsory)	Varies up to 50%	3 x sal. up to max. \$40,000 (eff. Jul. 1 '65)	Yes, disabled receive face value of policy	Yes (compulsory)	Yes	50%	to 67	approx. 70% of salary
Brandon	Yes (compulsory)	44%	Marr. 200% sal. Sing. 100% sal.	No	Yes (compulsory)	Yes	44%	to 68	50% of sal. (and pen. premiums)
St. John's	No	—	—	—	—	—	NO SEPARATE PLAN	—	—
St. Paul's	No	—	—	—	No	—	—	—	—
Manitoba	Yes (compulsory)	50%	Men: 2x ann. sal. Women: 1 x ann. sal.	Yes, Prem. disabled receive full value of policy	Yes (compulsory)	Yes	50%	to 65	Appr. 60% of sal. (tax free) plus pen. & life ins. prems.
Lakehead	No	—	—	—	Yes (part of Ont. Tea. Superann. Act)	Yes	Appr. 50% (pd by prov. govt.)	No stated max.	same as pension formula
Windsor	Yes (compulsory)	50%	200% of sal. double indem. to 400%	part of pkg. plan	Yes (compulsory)	Yes	50%	to 65	50% of salary
Western	Yes (compulsory)	Actual % unknown	200% of sal. plus \$5,000	Yes, for dismemberment	Yes (compulsory)	Yes	50%	men, to 65 women, to 62 to retirement age	40-50% of salary
Waterloo	Yes (compulsory)	50%	decr. from 2.5x sal. at 35 to 1x sal. at 55	No, but premiums sal. at 35 to 1x waived if disabled	Yes	Yes	50%	—	60% of salary
Waterloo Lu.	Yes (voluntary)	50%	1 to 2 1/2 x sal. dep. on age	Yes, for dismemberment	Yes	Yes	50%	to 65	50% of salary
McMaster	Yes (compulsory)	"significant contrib."	300% of sal.	Yes, disab. rec. up to full val. of pol. tot. & perm. disab.)	—	—	NO SEPARATE PLAN	—	—
Laurentian	Yes (voluntary)	40%	2 x ann. sal.	part of pkg plan	Yes (voluntary)	Yes	40%	to 65	\$400/month same as pension formula
Guelph	Yes (provided by fac. association)	Nil	\$10,000	No	Yes (as part of Public Service Superann. Act)	Yes	Approx. 50%	No stated max.	—
Toronto	Yes (compulsory)	small fraction	300% of sal. to age 45 decreasing to 100% of sal.	Yes, \$17.70 per \$1,000 of ins. per month during disability (max. 5 yrs)	NO SEPARATE PLAN. DISABLED PERSONS RECEIVE ACCRUED PENSION BENEFITS BEFORE AGE 60, FULL ACCRUED PENSION AFTER AGE 60.	—	—	—	—
Queen's	Yes (voluntary)	60%	varies with sal.	Part of a benefit package plan	NO SEPARATE PLAN. DISABLED PERSONS RECEIVE A MONTHLY PENSION AS STATED IN THE PENSION PLAN	—	—	—	—
Carleton	Yes (compulsory)	50%	TIAA - unit schedule	No, but premiums waived if disabled	Yes (voluntary)	For two years	50%	to 65	50% of salary (& pen. premiums)

Ottawa	Yes (voluntary)	50%	Varies	No	Yes (voluntary)	No	Nil	to 65 if accident, 5 yrs. if sickness	Varies
Montreal	Yes (compulsory)	100%	appr. 1x sal. to max. \$10,000	No, but premiums waived if disabled			NO SEPARATE PLAN		
McGill	Yes (compulsory)	50%	appr. 2 x sal. (Sup. cov. for mar'd mem.)	Yes, disabled before 60 receive full amount of policy	Yes (compulsory)	Yes	50%	to retirement age	50% of salary (\$1,000 max.) & pension premium
Loyola	Yes (compulsory)	50%	3 x ann. sal (1 x for women) less accum. pen. benefits	Yes, if permanently disabled	Yes (compulsory)	No	N/A	36 months	3 x salary
Sir Geo. Wms.	Yes (compulsory)	50%	nearest \$1,000 gr'ter than sal.	Yes, if totally disabled			NO SEPARATE PLAN		
U.N.B.	Yes (voluntary)	20%	approx. 2 to 2½ x ann. sal.	Yes, up to \$20,000 payable over 5 yrs.			NO SEPARATE PLAN		
Prince of Wales	Yes (voluntary)	prov. govt. por. unk	govt. approx. ann. wn sal.	No			NO SEPARATE PLAN		
St. Francis Xavier	Yes (voluntary)	100%	\$5,000	No, but premiums waived during disability	No		NO SEPARATE PLAN		
Dalhousie	Yes (compulsory)	40%	200% ann. sal. up to \$20,000	Yes, total face val. paid over 5 yrs.			NO SEPARATE PLAN		
St. Mary's	Yes (voluntary)	50%	\$10,000	No	PEOPLE WHO BECOME PERMANENTLY DISABLED RECEIVE THEIR FULL PAID-UP PENSION				
N.S. Tech.	Yes (compulsory)	25%	2 x ann. sal.	Yes, lump sum life pol. if tot. disab.			NO SEPARATE PLAN		
Memorial	Yes (compulsory)	50%	appr. ann. sal. dec. with age	Yes, full value of life policy			SEPARATE PLAN UNDER CONSIDERATION		
Laval	No except as death benefit in pension plan	50%	1½ x ann. sal.	Yes, for persons pensioned due to perm. disability	Yes (as part of pension plan)	No	50%	No stated max.	62% of normal pension formula
York	Yes (compulsory)	Nil	300% of sal. reducing after age 45 to 100% age 65	Yes, for total and perm. disability			SEPARATE PLAN NOW UNDER STUDY		
Bishop's	Yes (voluntary)	App. 50%	\$15,000 for married men, \$1,000 for sing. men & women	Yes, about \$250 per month over 5 yrs. for mar. men	No				
Sherbrooke	Yes (voluntary)	50%	\$50,000 - men \$25,000-women	Standard disability waiver, also waiver of premiums	Yes (voluntary)	Yes	50%	to retirement age	50% of salary plus total contribs to pension fund
Victoria	Yes (compulsory)	50%	\$64,000 at 25, decreasing to \$10,000 at 50.	Separate plan	Yes (compulsory)	Yes	50%	to 65	60% of salary
Mt. Allison	Yes (voluntary)	50%	TIAA - 4 units (inc. to 6 units under consid.)	No, premium waiver only			SEPARATE PLAN FOR 1965-66 UNDER STUDY		



# SURGICAL MEDICAL INSURANCE

## HOSPITAL INSURANCE

## PAID SICK LEAVE

	1 Surgical Medical Plan?	2 Portion of total cost paid by Institution?	3 What deductible a) per member b) per family	4 Does plan offer major medical features? (Doctor's visits, drugs, psychiatric fees)	5 Any maximum amount payable by insurer?	1 Are Faculty covered by compulsory Prov. Hospital Insurance?	2 Does Univ. Contrib.? no prems. involved	3 Is suppl. Prov. Hosp. Insurance avail.?	4 Does Univ. contrib.?	1 Are Faculty Paid sick leave when ill?	2 Is sick leave plan formal?
U.B.C.	Yes, com- pulsory	50%	Nil	All except drugs	None except \$300 per lifetime for psych. fees	Yes	No	No	—	Yes	formal
Alberta	Yes, optional	Nil	no answer	All except drugs	no answer	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	formal
Sask.	ALL FACULTY COVERED BY PROVINCIAL MEDICAL CARE INSURANCE					Yes	no prems. involved	No	—	Yes	formal
Brandon	Yes, optional	Nil	—	All except drugs and psych. fees	—	Yes	No	No	—	Yes	formal
St. John's	No	—	—	—	—	Yes	No	No	—	Yes	informal
St. Paul's	Yes, non- contributory	100%	Nil	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	informal
Manitoba	Yes, com- pulsory	50%	Nil	No (separate, non- contrib. plan available)	Up to \$200 dep. on operation	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	formal
Lakehead	Yes	Nil	Nil	All except drugs and psych. fees	No	Yes	No	No	—	Yes	formal
Windsor	Yes, optional	50%	Nil	No	N/A	Yes	50%	Yes	No	Yes	informal
Western	Yes, com- pulsory	50%	a) \$25 b) \$75	All covered	\$10.00 per person (every 3 years)	Yes	50%	No	—	Yes	formal
Waterloo	Yes, com- pulsory	50%	a) \$50 b) \$100	All covered	80% of bal. up to \$15,000 (\$500 per illness)	Yes	50%	Yes	—	Yes	formal
Waterloo Lu.	Yes, optional	50%	a) \$50 b) \$100	All except psych. fees	\$15,000 per person	Yes	50%	Yes	50%	Yes	formal
McMaster	Yes, com- pulsory	100% if single 32% with depend.	a) \$50 b) \$150	All covered	80% of bal. up to \$10,000	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	informal
Laurentian	Yes, optional	40%	a) \$25 b) \$75	All covered (psych. partially)	\$10,000 per person	Yes	50%	No	—	Yes	informal
Guelph	Yes, optional	Nil	Nil	All except drugs & psych. fees & special nursing	No	Yes	No	No	—	Yes	formal
Toronto	Yes, optional	Nil	Nil	All except drugs & psych. fees	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	informal

Queen's	Yes	Nil	a) \$50 b) \$100	All covered	Lifetime limit \$15,000	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	informal
Carleton	Yes, optional	50%	\$50 per member of family	All covered (psych. partially)	\$25,000 per person	Yes	50%	No	—	Yes	informal
Ottawa	Yes, compulsory	Nil	a) \$50 b) \$100	All covered	\$5,000	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	informal
Montreal	No	—	—	—	—	Yes	no prems.	No	—	Yes	informal
McGill	Yes, compulsory	50%	\$25 per member of family (\$75 max.)	All covered	\$5,000 per year	Yes	no prems.	Yes	50%	Yes	formal
Loyola	Yes, optional	50%	a) \$50 b) \$150	All covered (psych. fees partially)	\$10,000 per person subject to reinstat.	Yes	N/A	Yes	50%	No formal provision	
Sir Geo. Wms.	Yes, optional	Nil	a) \$50 b) \$50	All covered (drugs partially)	\$10,000 per person	Yes	N/A	No	—	Yes	informal
U.N.B.	Yes, optional	25%	\$50 for 3 member family	All covered	80% of bal up to \$5,000	Yes	N/A	Yes	20%	Yes	informal
Prince of Wales	No	—	—	—	—	Yes	N/A	No	—	Yes	formal
St. F.X.	Yes, non-contributory	100%	Nil	In hospital treatment only	70 days per illness	No	—	N/A	—	not officially	
Dalhousie	Yes, optional	Nil	Nil	All except drugs & psych. fees	No	Yes	No	No	—	variable	informal
St. Mary's	Yes, optional	Nil	Nil	All except drugs & psych. fees	No	Yes	N/A	Yes	No	Yes	formal
N.S.Tech	Yes, optional	Nil	Nil	All except drugs & psych. fees	No	No	—	Yes	100%	Yes	formal
Memorial	Yes, compulsory	50%	first visit not covered	All covered	variable	Yes	N/A	University scheme available			formal
Laval	No (a non univ. plan is available)	Nil	Nil	All except drugs & psych. fees	75 doctors visits per person per year	Yes	no prems.	Yes	No	Yes	informal
York	Yes, optional	Nil	—	All except drugs & psych. fees	—	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	informal
Bishop's	Yes, optional	25%	Nil	In hospital only, including drugs	Schedule of max. payments	Yes	N/A	Yes	25%	Yes	informal
Sherbrooke	Yes, optional	50%	a) \$35 b) \$70	All covered	\$10,000 per person	Yes	no prems.	Yes	50%	Yes	informal
Mt. Allison	Yes, optional	Nil	N/A	All except drugs (new plan under study)	No	Yes	N/A	Yes	—	Yes	informal
Victoria	Yes, optional	50%	Nil	All except drugs & psych. fees	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	informal



## EDUCATION OF FACULTY CHILDREN

## SABBATICAL LEAVE

5

4

3

2

1

4

3

2

1

What part of tuition fees is waived for Fac. children?

Is Fac. mem. free to choose any university?

Are fees for grad. study also remitted?

Does univ. remit fees for children of deceased Fac.?

Does univ. grant sab. leave as a matter of policy?

What part of ann. sal. is paid to person on sab. leave?

Does univ. assist in meeting travel and research costs while on leave?

Do contrib'n's to pension plan continue during sab. leave?

Is sab. leave contingent on undertaking to return for specific no. yrs.?

U.B.C.	Nil	N/A	No	Faculty may contribute	No	up to 60%	usually not	Yes	No
Alberta	Nil	N/A	Yes, for grad. teach. assist.	Yes	Yes	50% to 80% dependent on length of service	No	Yes	Yes, 2 years
Sask.	Nil	N/A	No	No	Yes (now under review)	50% to 80% dependent on length of service	some assistance	Yes	No
Brandon	Nil	N/A	No	Yes	No (under negotiation)	Various arrangements (under negotiation)	not known	Yes	informal undertak'g (under negotiation)
St. John's	Nil	N/A	No	No	No	NO ANSWER RECEIVED	—	—	—
St. Paul's	Nil	N/A	No	No	No	50%	No	Yes	Yes, equal to period of leave
Manitoba	Nil	N/A	No	No	Yes	60% for those on study leave	No	not by univ.	Yes
Lakehead	50%	N/A	N/A	never arisen	No	100% after 12 yrs. 50% after 6 yrs.	No	Yes	No
Windor	Nil	N/A	No	No	Yes	varies, often 50%	occasionally	Yes (optional)	No
Western	\$150 with 66% standing	No	\$150 with 66% standing	\$150 with 66% standing	no stated policy (other leave granted)	50%	no firm policy	Yes	No
Waterloo	no policy	—	—	—	Yes	no established policy	nominal	Yes	Yes
Waterloo Lu	100%	No	no policy	No	No	usually 50%	Yes, usually	Yes	No
McMaster	Nil	N/A	No	No	Yes	no def. policy	No	Yes	No
Laurentian	Nil	N/A	No	No	N/A	leave with pay for post-grad. education	—	—	—
Guelph	Nil	N/A	No	No	No	50% (100% for half year)	No	Yes	No
Toronto	Nil	N/A	No	No	no, but leave of absence granted	dependent on length of service	no specified	Yes	No
Queen's	Nil	N/A	No	No	Yes	—	no specified	Yes	No

Carleton	100% bef. Sept. 1963, Nil after	No	Yes	Yes, if deceased was on staff prior to Sept. 1963	"As a privilege, not as a right."	usually 50%	No	Yes	No
Ottawa	50%	No	Yes	No	Yes	50%	No	not by univ.	No
Montreal	100%	ad hoc arrangements	Yes	under study	Yes	60%	some assist.	Yes	Yes, 3 years
McGill	66% if stu. is in good standing	No	Yes	Yes, if member had 10 yrs or more of service	No	50%	occasionally	Yes	No
Loyola	50%	No	No	no def. policy	yes, but not tested	50%	No	Yes	Yes
Sir G. Wms.	100%	No	Not yet	Yes, 100%	No	no policy	—	Yes	—
U.N.B.	50%	No	50%	50%	Yes	50%-75%	no spec. policy	Yes (by prov. govt.)	No
Prince of Wales	no offic. policy	—	—	—	Yes	50%	No	Yes	Yes
St. F. X.	100%	No	Yes	has not occurred	Yes	50%	no policy	Yes	No, except those on educ. leave
Dalhousie	Nil	N/A	No	No	Yes	50%	No	Yes	No written undertaking
St. Mary's	50%	no policy	no policy	no policy	Yes	50%	no policy	Yes	Yes, 2 years
N.S.Tech	Nil	N/A	No	No	No	approx. 50%	No	Yes	Yes
Memorial	Nil	N/A	No	No	Yes	75% if married 50% if single	No	Yes	Yes, 3 years
Laval	100%	No	No	No	No policy, granted according to individual circumstances	50%	No	Yes, on Sab. salary	No
York	Nil	N/A	No	No	Yes	usually 50%	No	Yes	No
Bishop's	100%	No	Yes, but not common	never arisen	Yes (details still to be decided)	—	—	—	No
Sherbrooke	Nil	N/A	No	No	No (only in exceptional cases)	full salary	N/A	Yes, on Sab. salary	N/A
Victoria	Nil	N/A	No	No precedents	Policy being formulated	varies, under review	Yes (on individual basis)	Yes	Yes
Mt. Allison	up to \$500 per year remainder ad hoc	No	No	Yes	No	no def. policy	no policy	Yes	Unwritten agreement to return

## MORTGAGE AND OTHER LOANS AND HOUSING

## RESEARCH, TRAVEL AND MOVING GRANTS

Does institution provide:-

Does institution:-

	1	2	3	1	2	3	4	5	6
	Mortgage loans to faculty?	Other loans to faculty?	Housing or Housing grants?	Make grants in aid of research?	Share in royalties or other returns from research?	Free faculty from teaching duties for research?	Subsidize publication of research?	Provide travel grants for research purposes or to learned soc. meetings? (amounts stated, 1963-64)	Pay moving allowances for new appointees?
U.B.C.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, in some departments	Yes	Yes, \$350,000	occasionally
Alberta	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes, \$150,000 (not for research) in 1964-65	Yes, one to two months' salary
Sask.	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, \$38,000	Yes, to \$1,000
Brandon	No	No	No	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes, $\frac{1}{2}$ % of univ. budget	Yes, variable amounts
St. John's	No	No	—	No	No	No	No	Yes, \$1,000	Yes, variable amounts
St. Paul's	No	No	No	Yes (small scale)	No	No	No	Yes, \$1,250	Yes
Manitoba	No	—	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes, approx. \$59,000	Yes, \$300-\$1,000
Lakehead	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes, \$1,000	Yes, up to \$500
Windsor	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes, \$41,100 (budget travel item)	Yes, \$500-\$1,000
Western	No	No	No	Yes (small scale)	Yes	very occasionally	occasionally	Yes, approx. \$50,000	in most cases, \$300 to \$1,500
Waterloo	No policy	No	No	Yes	Yes	in some faculties	No	Yes, no special budget category	Yes, based on circumstances
Waterloo Lu.	No	No	Yes on very limited basis	No	No	No	No	Yes, \$6,000	Up to half of moving expenses
McMaster	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes, \$100 p. person p. yr. to Learned Soc. meetings. Special grants for research projects	Yes, variable amounts
Laurentian	No	—	in prospect	No definite policy	—	—	—	Yes, \$15,000 (budget travel item)	—
Guelph	No	—	Yes on very limited basis	Yes (very ltd.)	No	varying dept'l. arrangements	Yes, totally	Yes, \$150,000 (budget travel item)	No policy
Toronto	No, but will guarantee bank loan	No	No	Yes	No, except on patents in some cases	No	Yes	Yes, amount not readily available	Yes, travelling expenses plus up to two-thirds of moving costs

Queen's	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes, \$17,350	occasionally up to \$500
Carleton	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes, amount not available	Yes, when pre-arranged
Ottawa	No	—	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes, approx. \$15,000	Yes, especially if married
Montreal	No	N/A	No	Yes, to obtain technicians	No	Yes	Yes, amount not disclosed	Yes, up to \$1,000
McGill	Yes	No	No	Yes, modest fund	In some cases, (Patents policy being formulated)	occasionally	Yes, \$25,000	only by negotiation
Loyola	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes, as required	Yes, up to \$500
Sir Geo. Wms.	No	—	No	pending	No	Yes	Yes, up to \$250 per full-time fac. member	Yes, up to \$750
U.N.B.	No	occ. short-term assist.	No	No	No	Yes	Yes, \$16,250	Yes, variable amounts
Prince of Wales	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes, with some restrictions	No, except in special circumstances
St. F. X.	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes, (no separate budget item)	Yes, amount decided by agreement
Dalhousie	Yes	No	a few apts are rented	Yes	No	varies with depts.	Yes, amount not disclosed by Univ.	Yes, 50% of moving costs
St. Mary's	no fixed policy	Yes, on ad hoc basis	No	Yes, on ad hoc basis	no policy	has happened	Yes, ad hoc basis	only travelling expenses
N.S.Tech	No	No	No	Yes	no formal policy	No	no def. policy	Yes, depending on distance
Memorial	Yes	Yes	No	Yes, \$10,000	No	generally no	Yes, \$6,500 in 1964-65	Yes, usually fully paid
Laval	In exceptional cases	No	No	Yes	No	No general policy (except in Faculty of Science)	Yes, \$95,000 for research, learned & professional societies, 1964-65	Normally up to \$500
York	No, but will guarantee bank loan	—	—	Yes	No	Yes	not yet occurred	Yes, cost of travel plus at least two-thirds of moving costs
Bishop's	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	no def. policy	Yes, up to \$200
Sherbrooke	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes, \$64,000, 1964-65	No
Victoria	No	No	No	Yes	No	Yes, on individual basis	Yes, \$12,000, 1964-65	Yes, maximum 1 months' salary
Mt. Allison	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes



## C.A.U.T. PRESS RELEASE, MARCH 25, 1965

The Canadian Association of University Teachers today sent the second of two telegrams to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, dealing with the case of Professor Mulford Q. Sibley, who was recently refused entry into Canada to fulfil a speaking engagement. The Association sent its first telegram on Monday; it reads as follows:-

Canadian Association of University Teachers greatly disturbed by refusal to admit Professor Sibley to Canada to fulfil speaking engagement (stop) On its face decision constitutes denial of free speech and is certain to be resented by university community (stop) We request full enquiry into facts with particular regard to source and grounds of complaint against Sibley.

Following the statement made on Wednesday by the Minister in the House, the Association today sent a second telegram, as follows:-

The Canadian Association of University Teachers regards as totally unsatisfactory the statement made in the House of Commons by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration on the incident involving Professor Sibley (stop) The Minister did not explain the incident or give any assurance against the occurrence of similar incidents in the future (stop) Further the Minister's exposition of the law on the subject is completely unacceptable (stop) There is nothing in the law that compels the course of action followed by the Immigration authorities (stop) We reiterate our request for a report on the source and grounds of complaint against Sibley.

The Canadian Association of University Teachers has some seven thousand members in university faculties throughout Canada. The telegrams were signed by the President, Professor Bora Laskin, of the University of Toronto, and Executive Secretary, Professor J. Percy Smith, of the national office in Ottawa.

### Communiqué de Press de l'A.C.P.U., le 25 mars 1965

L'Association Canadienne des Professeurs d'Université a expédié aujourd'hui un deuxième télégramme au Premier Ministre du Canada



et au Ministre de la Citoyenneté et de l'Immigration au sujet du Professeur Mulford Q. Sibley. Le gouvernement a récemment refusé permission au Professeur Sibley d'entrer au Canada à l'occasion que ce dernier voluait entrer le pays pour accepter une invitation à donner une conférence. L'Association a expédié le télégramme suivant lundi le 22 mars:-

Canadian Association of University Teachers greatly disturbed by refusal to admit Professor Sibley to Canada to fulfil speaking engagement (stop) On its face decision constitutes denial of free speech and is certain to be resented by university community (stop) We request full enquiry into facts with particular regard to source and grounds of complaint against Sibley.

Faisant suite à la déclaration aux Communes du mercredi, le 24 mars de la part du Ministre de la Citoyenneté, l'Association a expédié aujourd'hui le télégramme qui suit:-

The Canadian Association of University Teachers regards as totally unsatisfactory the statement made in the House of Commons by the Minister of Citizenship and Immigration on the incident involving Professor Sibley (stop) The Minister did not explain the incident or give any assurance against the occurrence of similar incidents in the future (stop) Further the Minister's exposition of the law on the subject is completely unacceptable (stop) There is nothing in the law that compels the course of action followed by the Immigration authorities (stop) We reiterate our request for a report on the source and grounds of complaint against Sibley.

L'Association Canadienne des Professeurs d'Université compte environ sept milles membres à travers du Canada. Les télégrammes portent les signatures du Président de l'Association, le Professeur Bora Lakin de l'Université de Toronto et du Secrétaire Général, le Professeur J. Percy Smith.

(Editor's Note: The C.A.U.T.'s was one of many protests, and Professor Sibley has since entered Canada and delivered his address. The C.A.U.T. has received a letter from the Prime Minister in reply to these two telegrams.)

## BOOK REVIEW

A Review of Ingraham, Mark H.; *The Outer Fringe: Faculty Benefits Other Than Annuities and Insurance*. Madison, Wis.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1965. 304 pp. \$7.50, hard cover; \$2.00, paper back.

by Witold Weynerowski\*

University faculty often appear reluctant to expose themselves to the far-ranging subject of non-salary or "fringe" benefits. The subject, enshrouded in its own peculiar terminology, is admittedly a complex one, especially when discussion centres on superannuation and group insurance schemes. However, as the title indicates, *The Outer Fringe: Faculty Benefits Other Than Annuities and Insurance* by Professor Mark H. Ingraham, concentrates attention on the less technically involved and also less discussed fringe benefits. This much-needed pioneering study, made possible by the initiative and collaboration of the A.A.C. (Association of American Colleges), T.I.A.A. and the A.A.U.P., discusses with urbane wit and wisdom a host of staff benefits currently offered at American universities and colleges. The author, a professor of mathematics and a former dean of the College of Letters and Science at the University of Wisconsin, has written a very readable text which abounds with penetrating insights on the relative importance for university faculty of such benefits as sabbatical leaves, housing, tuition fees for faculty children and income continuance during sickness. In short, we are informed what the current practices and the attitudes to them are (as revealed by replies to the extensive questionnaire drawn up for this study by Dr. Francis P. King of the Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association), and we are also given an assessment of the possible value of the individual benefits for different types of institutions.

Professor Ingraham does not shirk a number of basic questions. Can certain fringe benefits be justified at all? Is it not better to extend personal choice by paying larger salaries, leaving the faculty member free to purchase those benefits he desires for himself and his family? What priority should be given to certain benefits in relation to certain other benefits?

---

\*Research Assistant in the C.A.U.T. national office.

The author recognizes that each university must work out for itself an order of priorities among the staff benefits it now offers. However, in his personal view, highest priority might well be given to research and sabbatical leave and, for certain types of universities, to faculty housing. In addition to these two subjects, separate chapters are devoted to numerous other benefits including loans or emergency funds to faculty, moving expenses, discount purchases, leave other than sabbatical, faculty travel expenses, faculty club facilities, assistance to retired faculty members and widows, and secretarial assistance.

The findings of the study are of considerable interest. For example, of the 757 public and private institutions surveyed, almost all provide for liberal periods of leave without pay, permitting faculty members to take time off for study, research, service in visiting professorships, or to take temporary positions or projects in business and government. Sixty per cent offer sabbatical leaves of absence, usually either a full year at half pay or a half year at full pay, and usually taken in the year following six years of service. About sixty per cent of the group of institutions surveyed report a housing program for certain categories of staff members. For children of their own faculty members, ninety percent of privately supported colleges and universities make no tuition charge or charge a reduced fee.

Clearly, Professor Ingraham's study will be of inestimable value to universities wishing to take stock of their program of staff benefits. The author recommends that such self-studies be undertaken periodically by a committee representing both faculty and administration. Indeed, this study is expected to lead to a series of follow-up conferences to be held on various campuses throughout the United States.

For Canadian universities, many parts of this book are of close relevance. The many thoughtful evaluations made of individual benefits and the policy recommendations offered should be carefully considered in this country. As Canadian universities are now rapidly improving their more immediately important pension and group life and disability insurance schemes and are increasingly turning their attention to other staff benefits, Professor Ingraham's book will prove more and more to be a welcome, indeed indispensable, reference and guide.

## NOTICE OF POSITIONS VACANT\*

*University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario:* Department of Educational Research. Applications are invited for the following research/teaching posts: (1) Associate Professor of Philosophy in Educational Research. Candidates should have a Ph.D. in Philosophy and have displayed an interest in the relation of philosophical thought and educational problems; they should have a broad background in the history of thought and a specialized interest in one or more of epistemology, ethics, belief systems, philosophy of mind and/or philosophy of history, science or language; (2) Assistant Professor of Economics. Candidates should have a Ph.D. in Economics and have experience which, although not directly related to education, may be applied to the following type of research problems: Studies of educational investment and the regional economy; Studies of employment market and the programs of schools; Implications of economic trends for school reorganization and vice versa; Input - output studies on educational investment and educational product; (3) Assistant Professor of Educational Planning. Candidates should have a Ph.D. in Demography, Economics or some relevant discipline preferably with experience in planning, which may be applied to research projects requiring: Studies of staff utilization; Projections of school population, plant needs, etc.; Construction of alternative models of growth for a particular educational institution, or type of institution; Models of organizational forms, size of school units, etc. Initial salary according to qualifications and experience ranging from \$8,500-\$10,500 for Assistant Professor, and \$10,000-\$12,000 for Associate Professor. In the case of a well qualified candidate for (2) or (3), appointment might be made at the higher level. Appointments are from July 1st, but may be from September 1st by arrangement. Applications together with the names of two referees should be submitted not later than May 20, 1965 to Dr. R. W. B. Jackson, Director.

---

\*Notices of positions vacant are carried free of charge.

## NOTICE OF PERSONS AVAILABLE FOR APPOINTMENT\*

Replies should be addressed to the relevant Box No., C.A.U.T.  
National Office, Room 603, 77 Rue Metcalf St., Ottawa, Ontario.

*Box 76. French and Spanish:* Assistant Professor, Man 32, Licence-ès-Lettres, Toulouse, France. Graduate studies for Ph.D. University of Michigan. 3 years Lycée experience in France, 8 years university in U.S.A. Perfectly bilingual and familiar with both cultures and literatures. Taught all undergraduate levels, language and literature in both fields. Available immediately.

---

\*Notices of persons available for appointment are carried at \$2.00 for 40 words and \$3.00 for 50 words. Notices for insertion should be sent to the C.A.U.T. National Office.

### EVERYMAN'S LIBRARY EVERYMAN PAPERBACKS MERIDIAN BOOKS

Over a thousand titles!

Basic lists of texts and supplementary  
books in English, History, Philosophy,  
Classics and the Social Sciences.

For complete lists and information,  
please write to the publisher.



*J. M. DENT & SONS/CANADA/LTD.  
100 Scarsdale Road, Don Mills, Ont.*



# C O P P

## ECONOMICS IN A CANADIAN SETTING

### Second Edition

*M. I. Inman and F. R. Anton*

This edition is a complete revision of the successful text published in 1959. All facts, figures, and tables have been revised, and the diagrams have been redrawn and enlarged. The authors have rearranged the material in order to simplify the presentation, and have provided Appendices which include additional and more advanced reading.

**\$8.50**

# CLARK

HISTORICAL STATISTICS OF CANADA M. C. Urquhart, K. A. H. Buckley *et al.* \$15.00  
 THE CANADIAN ECONOMY: SELECTED READINGS Revised Edition  
 Edited by J. J. Deutsch, B.S. Keirstead, Kari Levitt, and R. M. Will  
 Cloth about \$6.00; Paperback about \$3.50

CANADIAN ECONOMIC POLICY Revised Edition  
 By T. N. Brewis, H. E. English, Anthony Scott, and Pauline Jewett  
 August; Cloth about \$6.00; Paperback about \$3.50

ECONOMIC GEOGRAPHY OF CANADA  
 By P. Camu, E. P. Weeks, and Z. W. Sametz Students' Edition \$8.95

CANADIAN SOCIETY: SOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVES Revised Edition  
 Edited by B. R. Blishen, F. E. Jones, K. D. Naegele, and John Porter \$6.50

CRIME AND ITS TREATMENT IN CANADA  
 By W. T. McGrath and 15 others August; about \$8.00

COMPOSITION FOR CANADIAN UNIVERSITIES  
 By Elizabeth Waterston and Munro Beattie Paperback \$2.75

THE FUNDAMENTALS OF CLEAR WRITING A. H. Hoole Cloth \$3.25; Paperback \$1.25

ENGLISH POEMS, 1250-1800  
 Edited by S. Warhaft, J. Woodbury, and P. O'Flaherty Paperback \$1.50

A HEINE VERSE SELECTION Edited by G. W. Field \$1.50  
*College Classics in English General Editor—H. Northrop Frye Paperbacks*

CHARLES DICKENS: GREAT EXPECTATIONS Edited by R. D. McMaster \$1.35

JONATHAN SWIFT: A SELECTION OF HIS WORKS Edited by P. Pinkus \$1.35

FRANCIS BACON: A SELECTION OF HIS WORKS Edited by S. Warhaft \$1.50

THREE RESTORATION COMEDIES Edited by G. G. Falle \$1.50

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY OF CANADA LIMITED

NEW BOOKS BY CANADIAN UNIVERSITY TEACHERS

**P.-A. CREPEAU AND C. B. MACPHERSON, EDS.**

The Future of Canadian Federalism/L'avenir du fédéralisme canadien. \$4.95 cloth, \$1.95 paper

**MARTIN L. FRIEDLAND**

Detention before Trial: A Study of Criminal Cases Tried in the Toronto Magistrates' Courts. \$9.25

**JOHN PORTER**

The Vertical Mosaic: An Analysis of Social Class and Power in Canada. \$15.00

**JAMES A. LEITH**

The Idea of Art as Propaganda in France, 1750-1799: A Study in the History of Ideas. \$4.95

**E. J. H. GREENE**

Marivaux. \$8.50

**CHARLES M. JOHNSTON**

The Valley of the Six Nations: A Collection of Documents on the Indian Lands of the Grand River. \$5.00



UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO PRESS

